

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 3 and 4 are added for examination. Therefore, on entering this amendment, claims 2-4 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Background Art of the specification of this application Part 2 from pages 5-6(hereinafter Background) in view of Langford et al. (6650516 B2).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejection of Claim 2 as being unpatentable over The Background Art of the specification of this application Part 2 from pages 5-6(hereinafter Background) in view of Langford et al.

The present invention, as recited in claim 2, requires a current controlling device that causes a rectifying current of the current control rectifying element to be in a reducing condition and a non-feeding condition. After this, the contact of the relay apparatus is opened when the power supply is turned off.

For example, in the exemplary embodiment of Fig. 1, the current control rectifying element 33 connected in series to the relay apparatus 31 is included. Therefore, when a power supply is turned off, the rectifying operation of the current control rectifying element is stopped at first, and then, a contact point of the relay apparatus is opened.

Because of such a structure, the power supply to the smoothing apparatus 34 and the driving unit 35 is turned off without fail. Importantly, even if one of the relay apparatus and the

current control rectifying element breaks down such that it always stays on, the other can turn off the power supply. Therefore, it is possible to stop the motor without fail.

Such a structure also prolongs the lifetimes of contact points by avoiding an arc, which is harmful to the contact points, from being produced between the contact points of the relay apparatus upon turning off the power supply.

However, the technique suggested by the background art in the present Specification (pages 5-6) is completely different. In this technique, when a drive operation is turned OFF, it is determined if the current is larger than or equal to a predetermined value.. In such a case, the operation is not carried out. In relation to prior art Fig. 7, a current value detecting means 82 detects a contact current of a relay 81. If the detected current exceeds a predetermined value, the control unit 83 locks a releasing operation of the relay contacts. On the other hand, if the detected current is smaller than the predetermined value the relay contacts are released.

Clearly, the above teaching in the background art is not a suggestion for the current controlling device to cause the rectifying current to be in a reducing condition and a non-feed condition and then to open the relay circuit when the power supply is turned off as in the present invention. In other words, detecting whether a current is equal to or above a threshold and then not releasing the relay contact as in the background art is completely different from causing the rectifying current to be in a reducing condition and a non-feed condition and then opening the relay circuit as in the present invention.

According to *KSR*, an invention is obvious where a simple combination of well known elements did not perform any new function to achieve any result that is not predictable. In the present case, is not predictable that the structure of the background specification be modified to function as in the present invention where a rectifying current is placed in a reducing condition and a non-feeding condition before releasing the relay contacts when the power supply is turned on. In other words, such an operation is not a predictable use of prior art elements as required by *KSR* to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

New Claims

New claims 3 and 4 are presented for examination. The support for these claims can be found at least in page 2, lines 16 and 17 of the present Specification.

Drawings

The Applicants respectfully submit a revised version of Figs. 6-7 duly marked “Prior Art” to overcome the objections noted.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/533,569

Attorney Docket No.: Q87581

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 2, 2009

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355